

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Advisory Action of January 11, 2005. The comments of the Advisory Action state in full "Applicant's argument is not persuasive. Applicant is referred to the Response in the Final Action." This terse statement does not respond substantially to the issues raised in the response filed September 22, 2004.

Applicant has explained in the Applicant's response filed September 22, 2004 how the Final Office Action is self-contradictory. Applicant specifically requested clarification on this point (see Response, p. 15, last paragraph, extending onto p. 16). Applicant further explained how the Patent Office's construction of the reference did not match the claim language, as required under an anticipation analysis (see p. 16, fourth full paragraph extending through p. 18). The remarks accompanying the Advisory Action do not provide any analysis of these arguments or any of the other arguments filed on September 22, 2004.

Applicant files the current Request for Continued Examination so that the Patent Office can provide a substantive analysis of Applicant's arguments. Specifically, the Patent Office is requested to clarify on which analysis of Mirayala the Patent Office is relying, and further address how the Patent Office's construction of Mirayala shows all the claim elements.

Applicant herein amends claim 23 to delete reference to many of the details about the gratuitous ARP request. As this represents a claim with a scope not previously analyzed by the Patent Office, this represents a new issue for the Patent Office.

Applicant requests claim examination and a more substantive response to Applicant's arguments filed in the previous response. As Mirayala does not teach or suggest a control system that changes states, Mirayala does not anticipate the claims. Applicant earnestly solicits claim allowance at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 21 2005

Respectfully submitted,

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By: 

Benjamin S. Withrow
Registration No. 40,876
P.O. Box 1287
Cary, NC 27512
Telephone: (919) 654-4520

Date: January 21, 2005
Attorney Docket: 7000-028

<p align="center">CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION</p> <p>I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING TRANSMITTED VIA FACSIMILE ON THE DATE INDICATED BELOW TO:</p> <p>Examiner: <u>Nguyen, Alan V.</u> Art Unit: <u>2662</u> Fax: <u>703-872-9306</u></p> <p><u>REBECCA ROOKS</u> Name of Sender</p> <p><u>Rebecca Rooks</u> Signature</p> <p><u>1/21/05</u> Date of Transmission</p>
